

Application No. 10/090,176

MXIC 1514-1
(P900234US)REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed 20 September 2005, the Examiner objected to the title. The Examiner reviewed claims 1-35. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and has indicated as allowable claims 2-8, 10 and 12-35.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 21, 26, 28, and 32. Claims 1-35 remain pending.

The Examiner's objection and rejection are respectfully traversed below.

Objection to the Title

The Examiner has objected to the title of the application because it is not descriptive. The title has been amended above to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection to the title of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donovan #5,914,753. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Note clarifying amendments to claims 1 and 9, without loss of scope.

Independent claim 1 differs from Donovan by at least the following limitation (as amended):

bridge logic which produces the output video stream having an output frame rate matching the input frame rate, in which an output frame has at least one of a variable number of pixels per line within the output frame, and a variable number of lines per frame among output frames in the output video stream.

The Examiner acknowledges implicitly that Donovan does not teach a system in which "an output frame has at least one of a variable number of pixels per line within the output frame, and a variable number of lines per frame among output frames" as required in the just quoted limitation of claim 1. In connection with this limitation the Examiner states, "It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the application of selective line count conversion as resulting in a variable count of lines per frame, as well as the selectivity of

Application No. 10/090,176

MXIC 1514-1
(P900234US)

pixels per line being variable by virtue of the user having selection of parameters (noting also the variable amounts of pixels per line in Fig. 17, for example, in that selected format), thereby meeting claim 1."

Applicant submits that the just quoted statement by the Examiner does not satisfy the burden to present a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. It is useful to consider the alternative limitations of "variable number of pixels per line within the output frame" and "variable number of lines per frame among output frames" recited in claim 1 in analysis of the patentability of claim 1. With regard to the former alternative limitation, the Examiner points to Fig. 17, and the fact that the number of pixels per line is variable according to a parameters set by the user in Donovan. Applicant does not understand what the Examiner considers to be a variable number of pixels in a Fig. 17. Fig. 17 is described at column 15 line 44 through column 16 line 68 of Donovan. There is no mention of a variable number of pixels per line in an output frame. The various sums as shown in Fig. 17 relate to the filtering of combinations of input lines to produce an output line, rather than the number of pixels per line in the output frame. In connection with the Examiner's comment that the number of pixels per line is set by the user's parameters, Applicant points out that the claim requires that the number of pixels per line be variable within in a single frame. The parameters of Donovan do not relate varying the number of pixels per line within a single frame. Applicant finds no suggestion to modify Donovan, and the Examiner does not provide any such suggestion, so that a variable number of pixels per line within a single frame would be implemented.

In connection with the latter alternative limitation, reading "variable number of lines per frame among output frames", the Examiner stated "It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the application of selective line count conversion as resulting in a variable count of lines per frame..." The Examiner has not provided a reasonable basis for this conclusion, as required for presentation of a *prima facie* case. Furthermore, the idea of selective line count conversion relates to conversion of the number of input lines to a number of output lines according to an integer ratio. In fact, Donovan sets forth "Equations relating input and output signals" beginning at column 11 line 11. The number of lines per frame on the output, TVLPP, is required to be an integer as stated at column 11, lines 34-36 and column 13, lines 53-65. There is no provision for varying the number of lines per frame in the output video stream. Applicant finds no suggestion to modify Donovan, and the Examiner does

Application No. 10/090,176

MXIC 1514-1
(P900234US)

not provide any such suggestion, so that a variable number of lines per frame within an output video stream would be implemented.

Accordingly, the Examiner's *prima facie* case as to claim 1 is incomplete.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and is patentable for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, it is not clear that the PLLs referred to in Donovan are used to generate an output clock signal. Rather, the PLLs are referred to in context of use to generate read clocks for the buffers used in the conversion of Donovan. See, Donovan, column 13, line 33 et seq.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and is patentable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 11 as amended is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-8, 10 and 12-35 are allowable. Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10, to incorporated subject matter of basic claim 1. Claims 5 and 7 depend from claims 4 and 6 respectively. Claims 12, 19, 21 26, 28, and 32 are amended to clarify antecedent basis of the output clock. The balance of the claims are not amended.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee determined to be due in connection with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0869 (MXIC 1514-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4 Jan 06

Mark A. Haynes, Reg. No. 30,846

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax